

## Durham Research Online

---

### Deposited in DRO:

23 May 2016

### Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

### Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

### Citation for published item:

Walby, K. and Hurl, C. (2014) 'Policing urban natures : conservation officer work in Ottawa and Toronto, Canada.', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38 (4). pp. 1476-1490.

### Further information on publisher's website:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12122>

### Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the accepted version of the following article: Walby, K. and Hurl, C. (2014), Policing Urban Natures: Conservation Officer Work in Ottawa and Toronto, Canada. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38(4): 1476–1490, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12122>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance With Wiley Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

### Additional information:

## Use policy

---

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Toppan Best-set Premedia Limited	
Journal Code: IJUR	Proofreader: Mony
Article No: IJUR12122	Delivery date: 13 Feb 2014
Page Extent: 15	

# Policing Urban Natures: Conservation Officer Work in Ottawa and Toronto, Canada

KEVIN WALBY and CHRIS HURL

## Abstract

*Drawing on the results of interviews and access to information requests, we explore conservation officer work in two urban regions in one Canadian province (Ontario). Specifically, we examine the work of the federal-level National Capital Commission (NCC) in Ottawa and the provincial-level Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA). Applying Jessop, Brenner and Jones's model of socio-spatial relations, we show how nature plays a different role in NCC and TRCA policing depending on the places their conservation officers work in, the kinds of territorial boundary maintenance in which they engage, the scaling of their activities in various jurisdictions, and the policing networks that they are part of. In assessing the place of nature in conservation officers' work, we contribute to debates about how the boundary between nature and the urban is produced through regulatory practices.*

## Introduction

Conservation officers now work *in* and *around* several Canadian cities, where provincial or national parks run through business districts or comprise the greenbelt and greenways that border municipalities. In urban areas, conservation officers not only engage in ecology-oriented work, such as regulating land developers who pollute parklands, but they have also become responsible for policing so-called nuisances such as homelessness and public sex. Here we demonstrate that the work of conservation officers does not simply entail protecting 'nature' from 'the urban'. Instead their work involves the production of urban natures, requiring boundary-making practices in which 'natural' spaces are constructed as 'pristine' and in need of protection from urban sprawl. In this context, conservation officers condone some human activities while others are framed as against nature or out of order.

Our purpose is to examine how urban natures or 'metropolitan natures' (Gandy, 2002) are produced through the policing practices of conservation officers in two agencies: the National Capital Commission (NCC) and the Toronto Regional Conservation Authority (TRCA). These two agencies serve as trend-setting models for conservation work in Canada. In the nation's capital, much authority has been vested in the NCC, a Crown Corporation with federal-level jurisdiction and the owner of 10% of the land in the Ottawa–Gatineau region. The downtown core has many NCC properties running through it that conservation officers police. In these sites, the work of conservation officers has

We would like to thank the four IJURR reviewers as well as Seantel Anaïs, Dale Spencer and Alex Luscombe for their comments.

focused on expelling 'nuisances' such as men having sex with men in public and homelessness. Operating in the urban environment, NCC officers have significant autonomy in enforcing their own regulations: the *NCC Property and Traffic Regulations* (2007).<sup>1</sup> Through these regulations, the NCC officers aim to manage the capital's image, cultivating a miniature vision of Canada in Ottawa. Because of the places in which NCC officers carry out regulatory activities, the territories that NCC officers seal off and the networks they work in, ecology-related regulation becomes secondary in NCC work. The primary focus is on order maintenance projects that disperse human activities considered to be offensive.

As the largest metropolitan area in Canada, and with a long history of inventive social and environmental planning, the Greater Toronto Area (GTA) has also played a key role in reframing conservation officer work in Canada. In seeking to alleviate intensive development pressures in the region, protected greenbelt areas have been established that conservation officers are responsible for policing. These lands are areas in which private encroachment is to some extent tolerated (Luymes and Tamminga, 1995; Erickson, 2004; Fung and Conway, 2007). Consequently, conservation officers engage in the work of boundary maintenance by trying to convince land users to comply with environmental regulations. This work is undertaken by the TRCA, which has provincial jurisdiction and enforces regulations under the *Conservation Authorities Act*.<sup>2</sup> The TRCA is chiefly concerned with managing 'fill' — regulating land use that could damage ecosystems. While the NCC is a federal agency oriented toward preservation of monumental public spaces that cut through the downtown, expelling those elements that fail to conform, the TRCA is oriented toward ecological protection in a green space shared by different municipalities and over which public and private interests quibble.

Through a critical case study analysis, we demonstrate how policing by Ottawa's NCC and TRCA officers is based on variable understandings of 'nature' and its relation to the urban environment. In examining how conservation officers negotiate the line between nature and the urban during their work, we apply Jessop *et al.*'s (2008) model of socio-spatial relations, examining the ways that conservation policing is embedded in different *places*, oriented toward enclosing different kinds of *territories*, advanced at different kinds of *scales*, and interlinked in a multifaceted policing *network*. We show how the organization of conservation work depends on the places that officers assume stewardship over. This entails recognizing how their work is informed by historically distinctive projects for the production of urban natures. While the policing of urban natures in downtown Ottawa is oriented towards order maintenance in drawing a rigid line between the monumental space of the public park and the city, working through metropolitan police networks in identifying 'nuisances' that threaten to despoil this 'natural' landscape (see also Valverde, 2011), in greenways the work of conservation officers is more oriented toward the ecological, actively brokering the use of green space by different actors in an ongoing process of negotiation.

This article is organized in four parts. First we examine literature on conservation officer policing through the lens of the production of urban natures. We look at how the boundaries between the 'artificial' space of the urban and the 'pristine' natural landscape are enacted through conservation officers' work. We draw from Jessop *et al.*'s (2008) typology of place, territory, scale and networks to conceptualize the way that conservation officers' work is situated in urban areas. Then we offer a note on method and the access to information requests we used to obtain conservation officer occurrence reports. Next, we provide comparative case studies to illuminate how place, territory, scale and networks shape NCC and TRCA conservation officer work. The comparison of the NCC and the TRCA shows how the place of nature in conservation officer policing depends on the kinds of territorial boundary maintenance that conservation officers

1 *National Capital Commission Property and Traffic Regulations*, SC 2007.

2 *Conservation Authorities Act*, RSO 1990.

engage in, the particularities of their different jurisdictions and the policing networks they are part of. We conclude by reflecting on debates about the ways in which urban natures are produced (Parés *et al.*, 2013) through the work of agencies such as conservation authorities.

## Conservation officers and the place of nature in policing

Most existing literature on conservation officers associates their work with rural areas. Existing research is directed toward traditional conservation activities, such as the policing of poachers who encroach on rural parklands (e.g. Forsyth, 1994; Pendleton, 1998). There has been a growing emphasis on how game wardens are also involved in law enforcement activities in the United States (Carter, 2004; 2006; Eliason, 2011). For instance, Hermer (2002) studied the role of game wardens in regulating a range of conduct in provincial parks in Canada and state parks in the USA. However, even as research on conservation officers has started to examine their policing function, there is a tendency to take the spatialities of conservation work for granted. With the exception of Shelly and Crow (2009), almost no literature has explored how working in different legal jurisdictions and on different geographic territories shapes what these officers do.

The underlying premise in the literature on conservation policing is that this kind of work is located *within* 'nature'. It is presumed that nature is a discrete space that is cleanly separated from the urban. Yet this distinction between the human and the natural has been questioned in recent geographic literature. As suburban land developments push into the areas surrounding cities, and provincial and national parks are created near urban zones, the boundary between the natural and the urban is reconfigured, leading to changes in the work of conservation officers. Conservation officers have become responsible for *producing* urban natures, from small city parks to sprawling greenbelts that extend seamlessly into suburban developments.<sup>3</sup> Conservation officers are not simply responsible for the protection of natural environments; in fact, through their work, they actively draw the line between the 'human' and the 'natural' in ways that enable them to maintain the environment as 'pristine'.

Public parks can be viewed as urban natures (Desfor and Vesalon, 2008), spaces built on cultural understandings of what nature should be, and which regulate the encounter with 'nature' in specific ways. The work of policing urban natures is predicated on a conservation discourse characterized by the compulsion toward 'purification', drawing lines between the 'human' and the 'non-human' and establishing 'a partition between the natural world, which has always been there, a society with predictable and stable interests and stakes, and a discourse that is independent of both reference and society' (Latour, 1993: 11). Conservation work should thus be viewed in the context of a larger cultural historical project, which entails specific understandings of humans and their place in nature. The project of creating parks and greenbelts that started in the nineteenth century has been oriented toward establishing an unspoiled space where humans can retreat into sublime contemplation of the natural. Along these lines, the public park has been designed to ensure that everything was in its proper place; the placement of every object was conducive to the production of a pristine whole and a corresponding sense of propriety in human conduct. As Joyce (2003: 227) notes in his history, modern public

3 In Calgary, provincial-level conservation officers work in the Fish Creek Provincial Park in the middle of the city. In Jasper, federal-level conservation officers work around the small municipality. In Vancouver, conservation officers patrol Cypress Provincial Park. Similar officers will be working in Toronto's newly established Rouge Park. In these jurisdictions, conservation officers work in parks and ravines, and on beaches and river islands. They use fines as an enforcement mechanism. Many conservation officers are peace officers under Canada's Criminal Code, which means that they have powers of search and seizure but do not carry handguns.

1 parks were often established as a means of engineering social improvement, prohibiting  
2 everything that interfered with 'rational and uplifting walks' such as gambling, dogs,  
3 drink, swearing, dirty clothes and games. The regulations governing public parks have  
4 consequently defined nuisances as any kind of 'bad neighbour' that generates a claim  
5 about disruption or contamination. Conservation officers ensure that the purity of the  
6 'natural' environment is upheld.

7 With growing urbanization, this compulsion to regulate the urban and the natural  
8 through public parks and greenbelts has become increasingly sophisticated. The kinds of  
9 natures produced by conservation officers are variable, depending on the places in which  
10 their work is embedded, the territories which they seek to enclose, the scales at which  
11 they operate and the networks that they are a part of. To conceptualize the parks,  
12 greenbelts and greenways that conservation officers work in, we borrow from the  
13 framework developed by Jessop *et al.* (2008) in distinguishing between different spatial  
14 dimensions of conservation policing. This typology helps us to avoid reliance on  
15 dichotomies such as urban and rural, and instead allows us to analyze the elements that  
16 make up those categories. Rather than framing such concepts from on high, we show how  
17 they play out on the ground through mundane conservation practices.

18 First, we examine how the work of conservation officers is embedded in specific  
19 places. Conservation officers are responsible for establishing a 'measure of  
20 groundedness' through seeking to govern the manner in which socio-natural relations  
21 crosscut a specific location (Escobar, 2001: 140). Rather than viewing places as fixed  
22 locations, we examine how public parks are embedded in broader processes of  
23 urbanization (Jessop *et al.*, 2008: 390). The distinctive location of public parks in the  
24 urban environment is significant for the work of conservation officers. To the extent that  
25 parks are located in a circumscribed downtown core, the manner in which they are  
26 regulated is different from the suburbs and amalgamated areas, where the distinction  
27 between the public and the private is open ended. While NCC property is situated  
28 throughout the downtown core of Canada's capital city, conservation officers in the GTA  
29 are responsible for policing larger areas.

30 Second, we examine how conservation officers seek to enclose public parks. Distinct  
31 processes of bordering, parcelization and enclosure mark the public park as a territory  
32 (Blomley, 2004; Jessop *et al.*, 2008: 393). It is bound up with specific conceptions of how  
33 such space should be used. While NCC officers adopt a view of the park as public  
34 property and are oriented toward the expulsion of 'nuisances' from *within* the park, the  
35 TRCA is oriented toward policing greenways which are based on a more porous  
36 understanding of public space and become involved in boundary maintenance,  
37 negotiating the edge *between* public and private space, and urban and natural space.

38 Third, we examine how the work of conservation officers is advanced at distinctive  
39 scales. Scale refers to processes of hierarchization and often is related to jurisdiction  
40 (Jessop *et al.*, 2008: 393). While the NCC operates on a federal scale as a Crown  
41 Corporation and has some autonomy in governing public parks over the municipalities,  
42 the TRCA operates as a provincial agency, and is more enmeshed in the intra-scalar  
43 politics of the amalgamated region (Taylor *et al.*, 1995). While the role of conservation  
44 officers under federal jurisdiction is to cultivate a sense of national identity through  
45 symbolic flower displays and other such spectacles, the provincial jurisdiction of the  
46 TRCA requires more focus on regional development goals.

47 Fourth, we examine the policing networks that conservation officers are a part of.  
48 Network analysis focuses on interconnectivity and interdependence (Jessop *et al.*, 2008:  
49 393). Insofar as conservation officers are responsible for regulating such urban natures,  
50 their work is part of a mixed economy of policing that bleeds beyond the park limits.  
51 Conservation officers can be viewed as part of a larger project of ordering space using  
52 law, and they are drawn into carrying out regulatory activities by other agencies in the  
53 network (see Table 1).

54 While the 'natural' space produced in the capital region's park cultivates a strong  
55 sense of monumentality, focused on maintaining order in an 'official' state space, the

**Table 1** Spatial elements of conservation officers' work

	Place	Territory	Scale	Network
National Capital Commission (Ottawa)	Canada's capital, downtown core, suburban, 175 km of recreational paths, 90 km of parkways	Parks, greenbelt, greenways	Federal	Municipalities, police agencies, security agencies
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority	Forests, streams, edge cities, 2,506 km on land and 961 km on water	Greenbelt, greenways	Provincial, municipal	Regional planning bodies, municipal, provincial

regional development model advanced in the GTA is oriented toward brokering compromise in a pseudo-public space in which the surrounding community maintains a proprietary interest. Focusing on the places in which conservation officers carry out regulatory activities, the territories that conservation officers seek to enclose, the scales at which they operate, and the networks that they are a part of, helps anchor our analysis of the production of urban natures in conservation work.

Research method

The NCC and the TRCA serve as trend-setting models for conservation work. We have selected the NCC and TRCA as cases because they are atypical (Yin, 2003) and unique and therefore potentially indicative of trends in conservation policing in Canada. As model agencies, located in the nation's capital and the largest urban region in Canada, their increased involvement in urban regulation is an indicator of what the future of conservation work in Canada might look like.

Though they are not conventional public police, which are traditionally more difficult to collect data from, these agencies were not easy to conduct research with. When we started this research, the NCC would not allow interviews with conservation officers (they have since allowed a half dozen interviews after repeated requests for access). As such, we developed a research strategy using access to information (ATI) requests to obtain stories that officers write about their work. Much of what conservation officers do in a day involves writing down stories about work in occurrence reports and it is these occurrence reports that we obtained using ATI.

ATI is a way of making public organizations disclose information that would not otherwise be released, to examine the texts not meant for public circulation. Use of ATI also comes with limits. For example, there are many ways that ATI requests can be stalled. Amber lighting refers to the tagging of a request as politically contentious, which leads to the request being delayed. It is also difficult to ascertain whether the documents released comprise a representative sample, whether key information was redacted, or whether certain key documents have been removed from the disclosure. Despite these barriers, we used ATI to produce a longitudinal dataset about the patterns of conservation officer work. This strategy is sequential, insofar as data from ATI requests can be used in forming subsequent interview questions. Using 15 requests, we obtained 1,015 NCC occurrence reports and public complaints from 1995 to 2010 regarding a variety of incidents (including public sex and homelessness, which we focus on below). We analysed the time and location of tickets and warnings, as well as the character of actions during occurrences reported in officers' stories. We also coded for references to place, territory, scale and networks. During an interview, an NCC officer stated 'I'm not sure what else we can tell you . . . the occurrence reports pretty much sum up our approach', which provides confidence that occurrence reports shed light on conservation officer



1 work. We also used the ATI materials to create probes for interview questions. Interviews  
2 with NCC officers focused the different spatial elements of their work. The NCC would  
3 only allow interviews with four officers. We use the interview excerpts as supplements to  
4 the document analysis.

5 The TRCA allowed for a ride-along in the jurisdiction described below, longitudinal  
6 interviews with a lead officer and the disclosure of the court files that comprise the case  
7 below. The court proceedings against the defendant occurred in the Ontario Court of  
8 Justice. The case is under appeal and the name of the defendant cannot be cited. Court  
9 files disclosed by the TRCA underwent redaction as per Ontario's freedom of  
10 information legislation. The files include TRCA correspondence with the landowner and  
11 TRCA studies of the land use in question. The example exemplifies the TRCA's  
12 approach to nature and the differences between the TRCA and the NCC in their  
13 respective regions.

## 14 15 The National Capital Commission

16 The NCC is a Crown corporation operating at the federal jurisdiction. It owns parks and  
17 properties that run through the downtown core of Ottawa. These properties also include  
18 many of the parks along the Rideau Canal and Colonel by Drive, and the parks along  
19 Island Park Drive, Ottawa River Parkway and Rockcliffe Parkway, extending east, south  
20 and west from the downtown core, and into the hills of the Gatineau Park. Because of the  
21 way the park system is territorially bounded in the city, its federal jurisdiction and its  
22 network relationship to other police agencies, the NCC possesses powers that are not  
23 shared by conservation officers elsewhere. NCC officers have assumed a distinctive style  
24 of stewardship over the Ottawa park system, oriented toward the expulsion of 'nuisance'  
25 activity from park space in the downtown core.

26 To understand place and conservation work in Ottawa, it is necessary to recognize  
27 how the NCC parklands are the product of a specific cultural historical project, which  
28 adopted specific assumptions about the relationship between humans and the natural  
29 environment. The contours of the NCC park system now inside the city were initially  
30 planned in the early twentieth century under 'city beautiful' concepts, which aimed to  
31 bring nature back into the city. Ottawa parklands were designed by Frederick G. Todd,  
32 who worked for the firm of Frederick Law Olmsted. Olmsted was the creator of Central  
33 Park in New York City. In designing Ottawa's public parks, Todd drew from Olmsted's  
34 philosophy, arguing that 'there is always the temptation to make a show so that people  
35 will see that something is being done, whereas the most pleasing way would be to have  
36 everything done in such a way that one would suppose that nature herself was  
37 responsible' (cited in Gordon, 2002: 33). Todd's aim in constructing public parks, at that  
38 time, was to expunge the 'human' element, establishing an area where the public could  
39 contemplate pristine 'nature'.

40 The circumscribed role of 'nature' in the urban environment was entrenched when the  
41 park system was taken under federal jurisdiction in 1927. In seeking to imagine this  
42 space as a miniature version of Canada, the NCC lands would play a symbolic role in  
43 nation building (Besmier, 2003). The park system was cordoned off as an official space,  
44 where citizens could experience a sense of national identity. The management of these  
45 lands was reframed under the discourse of regional planning in 1956 when the federally  
46 funded NCC took over from the Federal District Commission, with powers to ensure  
47 development of the new National Capital Region. However, aspirations toward spatial  
48 purity and monumentalism remain embedded in the landscapes of Ottawa's parks today.

49 Given the location of NCC park properties near the downtown core, conservation  
50 officer work has been directed toward expelling so-called nuisances that threaten to  
51 despoil the natural landscape. Consequently, the concerns of NCC officers in the  
52 downtown core are associated with police concerns for order maintenance. NCC officers

are trained by Royal Canadian Mounted Police officers in self-defence, investigative practices and the writing of occurrence reports. However, the concerns of NCC officers are also associated with a discourse of conservation. To the extent that conservation officers presume stewardship over a pristine space, they are granted discretion in identifying nuisances and expelling them from NCC lands. For instance, section 18 of the *NCC Property and Traffic Regulations* (2007), used to regulate park sex, states 'no person shall use any blasphemous or indecent language, or behave in an offensive manner, on any Commission property'. Any conduct that is construed as in violation of section 18 is defined as a nuisance and against the intended uses of the park. This is augmented by anti-camping regulations. Section 38, used to regulate homeless people, states 'no person shall camp, picnic or erect a tent on any Commission property not designated'. The following examples of regulation of public sex and homelessness show how NCC officers work to enclose the territory, separating it from the urban environment through tactics of dispersal. This can be contrasted with the work of TRCA officers in Toronto, who are more concerned with negotiating the boundary lines of public and private space through the advancement of an ecological lens.

### NCC policing of public sex: nuisance dispersal

NCC officers patrol NCC lands in and around Ottawa–Gatineau on foot or in trucks. One main task is to intervene in conduct that they consider to contaminate the park under section 18. A central duty of NCC officers is to police park sex, which takes aim at men with men 'cruising'. Picking up for anonymous park sex is construed as a nuisance. Most of the parks where this public sex takes place are lands that the NCC (or predecessor agencies) purchased in the earlier half of the twentieth century, extending west and east along the Ottawa River. Though these parks such as Rockcliffe Park and Britannia Park were built with the idea of bringing nature into the city as an antidote to industrialism and as a sanctuary for families, the use value of all their nooks and crannies has been extended in novel ways, including by men who enjoy public sex.

NCC officers target men having sex with men in part because of the number of public complaints about encounters on bike paths and condom wrappers scattered in the bushes. Several occurrence reports in our sample are public complaints to the NCC or NCC responses to public complaints. The NCC has also installed video surveillance cameras in at least one park along the Ottawa River (Mendoza, 2006). Officers make patrols in trucks that allow them to access computers, databases and background information on people they stop. The following are examples of occurrence reports that NCC officers prepare after monitoring sexual activity in Ottawa parks:

7 June 2009, Bates Island: 'while on foot patrol, observed two males together on picnic table . . . intercepted, advised of regulations, issued warning, expelled, not enough evidence to charge since they were just starting'.

27 June 2009, Rockcliffe Park: 'while on foot patrol observed two males masturbating each other . . . intercepted, advised of regulations, issued tickets, expelled'.

In addition to following men who have sex with men in parks, NCC officers patrol the internet and monitor the chat rooms that men use to set up their park encounters. NCC officers write down what they learn about in the chat rooms using their occurrence reports, and communicate it to other conservation officers and to other policing agencies in Ottawa. They organize sweeps (a mass bust of men having sex with men in parks). Based on the information provided in their reports, one of the chief activities of NCC officers appears to be the routine observation of male masturbation:

26 July 2009, Ottawa River: 'while on patrol observed one male watching another male masturbating. Intercepted, explained regulations, issued one ticket and one warning, expelled'.



6 September 2009, Bates Island: 'while on foot patrol, observed one male sitting in his vehicle masturbating . . . intercepted, advised of regulation, issued tickets'.

Occurrence reports are catalogued at headquarters. NCC officers leaf through their colleagues' reports about where to find the action before starting the next shift. The reports thus engender future policing efforts. Conservation officers not only target specific conduct, but precise spaces within urban parks (concealed areas like bushes and bluffs). In one report from June 2006, the officer is behind a tree waiting for action to begin to intervene: 'while on foot patrol observed several men in the bush. Could not get a clear view of illegal activity, except for one . . . intercepted person with his pants down. Issued warning (not enough for a charge)'. The description is couched in the language of criminal law though conservation officers do not have such powers themselves. In another report from August 2006, after receiving a phone complaint from an NCC trail user about a 'disgusting mess' of condom wrappers, NCC officers discuss how to respond. The head conservation officer then asks a group of others over email if they are able to do 'a little enforcement' and anything 'aside from doing more intensive brush clearing'. Men cruising in parks are treated as contaminants of the pristine environment.

NCC officers are ('pragmatically' in their words) trying to move the men out of the parks. As one NCC officer describes, 'Sometimes we stop the same person doing the same thing five six times a month. It's repetitive'. For example, in April 2009 'while on foot patrol observed five individuals in a circle masturbating . . . intercepted, advised of regulations, issued tickets, expelled'. And in June 2009, 'while on foot patrol observed two males doing oral sex plus one male watching . . . intercepted, explained regulations, issued tickets, expelled'. The pattern 'intercepted, explained regulations, issued ticket, expelled' is repeated in most occurrence reports. Rather than permanent removal, the configuration of place, territory, scale and network demands promotion of public order, which takes the form of dispersing nuisances such as public sex from NCC jurisdiction.<sup>4</sup>

### NCC policing of homeless people: nuisance dispersal

NCC conservation work also ensures that the park is only *visited* and not *inhabited* by humans. A dispersal-based orientation is evident in NCC officer policing of homeless people too. For instance, in June 2003, one conservation officer 'observed one of our regulars sleeping in the flower beds. Couldn't wake him. Had Ottawa Police Service come. Fire department came. Had to use a pole to wake him up. Expelled'. NCC conservation officers coordinate with Ottawa Police Service (OPS), private security, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) and other agencies — they are part of Ottawa's urban policing network. The following reports are suggestive of the many agencies involved:

30 April 2009, Plaza Bridge: 'report about homeless sleeping . . . not NCC land. Belongs to Parks Canada. Advise to call OPS or Parks Canada'.

28 April 2009, Confederation Park: 'received message from construction company there was vagrants sleeping, defecating around his job site. He said he would like us to take a look and explained that we would do our best in resolving the problem'.

As one NCC officer puts it, 'if we are going to do a blitz, we bring joint patrols'. Officers from these agencies share occurrence reports, further evidence of networking. As with public sex, concerns about who to regulate are generated by complaints to the NCC. For instance, in July 1999, there is a 'report from (a store owner) about four male vagrants

4 Conservation officers have access to different laws, such as land use regulations that are specific to their organization, resulting more in the use of tickets, rather than criminal sanctions. Fines operate to curb the frequency of an activity without subjecting it to criminal law. Yet more NCC officers have training in security management instead of ecology-oriented programs, reflecting the order maintenance orientation of the NCC.

1 sleeping in the courtyard. She said she wanted them moved, didn't look good for the  
2 tourists'. The policing of squatters extends into the greenbelt areas as well. In May 2009,  
3 for example, Ottawa residents write the following note to the NCC:

4 I am not sure to whom this complaint should be directed . . . our property backs on to the  
5 greenbelt. My husband and I were walking one of the regular trails last night around 8pm and  
6 we came upon what we believe to be a homeless person's dwelling. They had cardboard  
7 assembled in the trees, and a campfire going. Could you please tell me if this situation is  
8 something that can be rectified by the parks persons who patrol the greenbelt?

9 In response, the NCC sends a patrol to 'clean up' the area. This idea of 'cleaning up' the  
10 parks is indicative of the NCC approach to dealing with homeless persons, who are  
11 treated as undesirable objects to be removed from the parks during certain hours. This  
12 'cleaning up' approach is suggestive of how NCC officers deal with nuisance in the  
13 greenbelt and in the downtown. For one NCC officer, 'We have the downtown parks,  
14 there are lots of tourists coming, we don't need people passing out and making messes  
15 . . . we try our best to clean things up, make it a decent place'. The management of  
16 homeless people and their belongings as garbage is common with NCC officers. For  
17 example, in May 1999, the NCC officer writes 'vagrants and shelter to be cleaned-up'.

18 For NCC officers in Ottawa, conservation work is oriented toward the expulsion of  
19 nuisances that are construed as contaminants. Things either look out of place or like they  
20 belong. The work of conservation officers can thus be described as nuisance policing.  
21 Public sex and homelessness defile the park's image as a pristine space. The carving out  
22 of this pure space demands vigilance in warding off all kinds of activities that are 'against  
23 nature' in a normative sense.

24 As we have shown in analysing the policing of park sex and homelessness, sections 18  
25 and 38 do not allow NCC officers to do more than move people along, which is a task that  
26 the NCC performs when called on by other agencies in the policing network. The NCC  
27 works closely with the OPS and RCMP in dispersing 'nuisances' from public parks.  
28 Their position in the urban policing network of Ottawa creates demand for the NCC to  
29 regulate nuisances insofar as they are always responding to public complaints and calls  
30 from other agencies. The regulation of nuisances does not conform to typical  
31 expectations of conservation work. As one NCC officer put it, 'more than half of what I  
32 do is this stuff . . . I wasn't expecting it to be as rock n' roll as it is . . . you come from  
33 dealing with natural resources stuff and get into quasi-police work when you're in town,  
34 so I was surprised with the amount of that stuff you have to deal with'.<sup>5</sup>

## 36 The Toronto and Region Conservation Authority

37 Whereas NCC officers report that more than half of their work involves order maintenance,  
38 TRCA conservation officers note that most of their job involves environmental regulation.  
39 As one TRCA officer put it, they think of themselves as 'first responders to environmental  
40 damage'. This reflects a different kind of 'purification' work, one not oriented toward order  
41 maintenance. Rather than focusing on regulation of disorderly conduct *within* the park —  
42 such as public sex or homelessness — the TRCA is oriented toward maintaining the  
43 boundaries *between* public green space and private development. This reflects the porous

- 45 5 Conservation officer policing in Calgary is similar to the case of the NCC in Ottawa. Gentrification of  
46 the downtown east side has led to dispersal policing by Calgary's Fish Creek Provincial Park  
47 conservation officers. Homeless people are pushed out of Calgary's downtown into river parks and  
48 then pushed out of river parks by the Fish Creek conservation officers. Fish Creek officers map hot  
spots too. The occurrence reports are similar to the NCC reports. For instance, in April 2009 a  
conservation officer 'went looking for homeless'. In June 2009 a conservation officer wrote  
'homeless camp and individual removed from park'. And in September 2010, an officer writes  
'homeless camping in park . . . removed'.

boundaries between 'public' and 'private' space in the amalgamated regions around Toronto (Keil, 1998; Desfor and Keil, 1999; Keil and Graham, 2006). With intensifying development pressures on the urban periphery, there is a need to make certain that pristine natural spaces continue to exist to promote the health of the region.

Again, the place of conservation work is the product of a specific cultural historical project. The distinctive 'ecological' frame of the TRCA is rooted in the shift toward regional planning and government during the 1950s and 1960s. Metro Toronto, which brought the City of Toronto together with 12 villages and townships in 1954, was at the forefront of this movement (Magnusson, 1981). The need to develop an agency responsible for conservation management was apparent from the beginning, as Hurricane Hazel hit Southern Ontario that same year, destroying the homes of thousands but also drawing attention to land use and water table vulnerabilities. The provincial government established the TRCA to acquire land in flood-prone areas to build infrastructure and control the flood plain. There have been attempts at greenbelt planning in this region, although these are often outpaced by leapfrog development (Fung and Conway, 2007; Sandberg *et al.*, 2013).

One purpose of the TRCA is to protect people and property adjacent to flood-prone areas should another Hurricane Hazel happen. The TRCA acquires flood-prone and ecologically sensitive areas along the Humber River and further north into the forests and townships. As Desfor and Keil (2000) note, these preservation practices not only extend regional flood control but they provide recreational spaces. While the NCC parklands around Ottawa were built by urban planners who promoted a pristine notion of nature in the city, TRCA lands have been formed through the lens of scientific management of ecosystems. TRCA officers work in conjunction with ecologists, environmental engineers and planners who track ecological shifts in the GTA. In this approach to regional planning, the GTA is treated as a bioregion (Taylor *et al.*, 1995). The 1992 report from the Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront extended this 'ecosystem approach' to regulation based on a sense of integration between nature and the urban.

Under the modern scientific discourse of ecological management, the greenbelt in the GTA is treated as a natural space requiring protection to ensure the health of the metropolitan region. But while the 'public parks' protected by the NCC are cordoned off in many ways, the emergence of modern greenbelts and greenways is oriented toward cultivating 'connections' between the human and the natural worlds (Erickson, 2004; Fung and Conway, 2007). Hence, the report from the *Royal Commission on the Future of the Toronto Waterfront* (1992: 179) argues, 'the essence of greenways is connections — not simply connecting recreational areas through trails, but connecting wildlife habitats to each other, human communities to other human communities, city to country, people to nature'. The work of 'purification' here is a process of trying to get the greenbelt's neighbours to comply with environmental regulations.

Like all conservation authorities in Ontario, the TRCA has a set of regulations under the *Conservation Authorities Act* (1990), specific to its region. The Act is a legal knowledge (Valverde *et al.*, 2005) insofar as it mimics law but incorporates ecology, geography and geology. The *Conservation Authorities Act* is non-binding, with a maximum \$10,000 fine. TRCA officers attempt to encourage property owners to comply with the *Conservation Authorities Act*, meaning numerous consultations with property owners to ensure their use of fill abides by law. TRCA officers can also invoke the *Federal Fisheries Act* (1985).<sup>6</sup> when activities they encounter infringe on any lake, river or stream containing fish. The *Provincial Offences Act of Ontario* (1990)<sup>7</sup> also intersects with their work when the TRCA pursues violations in court.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> *Federal Fisheries Act*, RSC 1985.

<sup>7</sup> *Provincial Offences Act of Ontario*, RSO 1990.

<sup>8</sup> However, TRCA conservation officers lost their peace officer status in 2006. They no longer have the power to make a search and seizure without a provincial warrant.

## Separating bad neighbours from the natural

The GTA is an intriguing region in terms of the division between the natural and the urban. The ring outside of Toronto follows a polycentric pattern of development; the TRCA work in the wetlands, parks and floodplains that developers see as sites for growth. Our example focuses on an individual property adjacent to the Humber River. The Humber River is part of the regional flood plain. Below we describe one example of TRCA work that exemplifies the limits of compliance as a regulatory mechanism for achieving urban ecology. The property in question bordered on the Oak Ridges Moraine wetland near the city of Vaughan. Vaughan is a suburban city stretching out from the GTA that has experienced rapid development. The area includes the Elder Mills Forest range and is regulated by the *Conservation Authorities Act* (1990), such that no fill may take place in the area without a permit from the Conservation Authority. TRCA officers work along the rivers and meadows that make up the Oak Ridges Moraine, which are being encroached upon by the GTA. This encroachment started to occur in the latter half of the twentieth century, but was accelerated under the Conservative provincial government of Mike Harris in the mid-1990s (Keil and Boudreau, 2006).

The TRCA had previously considered purchasing the land, given the proximity to the Humber River, which is considered to be a sensitive area. In 2005, the property owner was alerted about the TRCA's *Fill, Construction and Alteration to Waterways* regulation (1990).<sup>9</sup> The letter from the TRCA specified all the steps that needed to be taken (an environmental impact assessment, a 30-day evaluation period) and the land use and fill allowable under the TRCA regulations. The property owner did not have permission from the TRCA to dump fill; the TRCA indicated they would not allow any proposed intensification of use and had made several consultations to attempt to garner consent. This ecology-related regulation is reliant on officers' ability to be persuasive. It is policing based on garnering consent with non-binding guidelines using fines as the primary enforcement mechanism. The task of TRCA conservation officers has been to ensure that bad neighbours do not contaminate the 'purity' of nature. TRCA officers demarcate a threatened 'nature' from an encroaching 'urban', thus rendering nature as an object that is to be protected from edge cities (see Hubber and Currie, 2007).

In November 2006, TRCA staff were forwarded a complaint regarding fill. The fill was for a parking area large enough to hold 40 or more cars. Fill was going over the edge of a bank and into the Humber River. Over 50 tandem loads had been pushed down the slope toward the Humber River in August and October 2006, an estimated 1,200 m<sup>3</sup> of waste. In April 2007, the TRCA officer met with an Ontario Justice of the Peace requesting a *Provincial Offences Act* search warrant for the property, to obtain photographs and samples of the site. TRCA enforcement officers took notes and pictures. The TRCA officers visited again in April 2007 with ecologists, engineers and planners to document erosion in the slope and damage to the Humber River.

During the search, the TRCA officer observed that the fill materials included concrete, garbage, skids, tires, metal and glass. The planner wrote that 'the fill material did not appear to be clean . . . more likely should have been destined for a disposal facility'. This fill did not take place in accordance with environmental regulations or with due notice to the TRCA. The fill added about 5 m of material, which was eroding and cracking, in contravention of the TRCA's Valley and Stream Corridor Management Program. No TRCA permits had been obtained. The embankment became unstable and as a result 'constitute[d] a high risk to both human safety and asset integrity'. The property owner had also dumped material into the oxbow connected to the river and the wetlands. In their assessment, the TRCA engineer focused more on the composition of the fill, while the TRCA ecologist assessed the reduced biodiversity of the valley forest. The *Federal Fisheries Act* (1985) could have been invoked given the proximity to the Humber River

9 *Fill, Construction and Alteration to Waterways – Metropolitan Toronto and Region*, RRO 1990, Reg. 158.



1 but the TRCA decided to pursue a provincial offense. The TRCA lawyer then sent a note  
2 to the property owner indicating that the TRCA would seek restoration of the site and that  
3 the property owner would be held financially responsible.

4 The TRCA decided to pursue legal action to force the property owner to restore the  
5 site. In court, a contractor acted as a witness and reported he saw another contractor  
6 pushing the fill over the edge with a bobcat. He said the fill was waste from new  
7 subdivisions near the city of Vaughan, an irony not lost on the TRCA officers who  
8 associate development near Vaughan with encroachment on the greenbelt and the Oak  
9 Ridges Moraine wetland. In the pictures produced as evidence from the investigation,  
10 there were water bottles and paint cans littering the banks of the Humber River.

11 The TRCA officers submitted evidence pertaining to the prior notice, the flood plain  
12 and high-quality forest designations of the land. The property owner was charged under  
13 section 28(16) of the *Conservation Authority Act* in the Ontario Court of Justice and was  
14 found to be in violation of that section. The Justice ruled that the property owner 'did  
15 unlawfully cause, suffer or allow development in the form of the placement of fill'. In the  
16 decision, the Justice ruled that the property owner will 'restore and stabilize the  
17 respective areas from which the fill is removed to original contours and grades'. If  
18 the property owner does not do so, the Justice stated, the TRCA is allowed to enter the  
19 property and have the fill removed and the area restored; the defendant is liable for the  
20 cost. In the court ruling, the Justice could have imposed a fine of \$10,000 and three  
21 months in jail. The Justice argued, 'Aesthetically speaking, the area is scarred, and  
22 appears unusable'. There is an ecological rationale in the ruling:

23 Although this property is privately owned, society in general is increasingly becoming aware  
24 of the cascading nature of environmental damage, and the possibility that small acts in small  
25 places can have far reaching and long lasting effects to the environment we all share. It is  
26 important that the general public understands the responsibilities that we, even in our positions  
27 as private property owners, have to this shared environment. And for that reason a penalty that  
28 I impose should not be a minimum penalty in this instance.

29 The penalty was \$6,000, and the cost to restore the site could be upwards of \$1,000,000,  
30 though the property owner pursued an appeal. Nevertheless, this example demonstrates  
31 how nature occupies a particular role in TRCA policing and its relation to boundary  
32 maintenance (Jessop *et al.*, 2008) and their 'stewardship' role in attempting to prevent  
33 bad neighbours from contaminating the 'purity' of the natural. This example also  
34 demonstrates the importance of jurisdiction and networks in conservation officer work,  
35 which we reflect on further below.

36 TRCA conservation officers are not situated in a policing network that requires them  
37 to engage in nuisance dispersal as NCC officers do. TRCA shared patrols are with  
38 ecologists not criminal law enforcement officers. The TRCA only has access to non-  
39 binding rules and they can only encourage compliance. TRCA officers have advocated  
40 for access to laws that would allow them more regulatory powers, since their  
41 compliance approach to policing depends on the good will of the violator to follow the  
42 TRCA rules. Compliance requires the party being policed to agree to rules; hence  
43 TRCA officers must make attempts at persuading property owners and land developers  
44 to comply with environmental regulations. As a workaround, TRCA officers have  
45 started to use probation orders to try to enforce compliance. Probation orders allow the  
46 TRCA to distribute additional fines to 'bad neighbours' who refuse to restore damaged  
47 sites.

## 48 49 Discussion and conclusion

50 Through a comparative study of the NCC in Ottawa and the TRCA, we have examined  
51 how conservation policing reorders and patrols the boundaries of urban natures. The



1 work of conservation officers involves more than simply protecting a 'pristine'  
2 environment from human encroachment. Conservation officers are continuously  
3 re-establishing the line between 'natural' and 'unnatural' forms of human activity.  
4 However, in confronting intensifying urbanization in the downtown core and in  
5 amalgamating regions, these conservation areas are far from 'pure' spaces. Conservation  
6 officers cultivate distinctive kinds of urban natures in their work.

7 Rather than operating with a reified notion of the urban and the natural as most  
8 existing literature on conservation officers tends to, we have sought to understand the  
9 spatialities of conservation work. Applying Jessop *et al.*'s (2008) model of socio-spatial  
10 relations, we examined how conservation work is embedded in a specific place in the  
11 urban environment, seeks to enclose territory, is framed at different scales and is  
12 enmeshed in a web of policing networks. There is variation in conservation officer work  
13 depending on the urban areas that make up their jurisdiction.

14 The NCC is responsible for establishing clear boundaries demarcating public parks  
15 as official state spaces within Ottawa's downtown core. Consequently, the work of  
16 conservation officers is oriented toward identifying and expelling 'nuisances' from  
17 *within* the park. Conservation officers in Ottawa regulate conduct such as park sex and  
18 homelessness. These activities are treated as offensive to the public and 'unnatural'  
19 contaminants that are incongruent with the 'natural' environment and, in the words of  
20 the NCC, must be 'cleaned up'. The dispersal of 'nuisances' is carried out following a  
21 federal mandate to provide a miniature version of Canada in and around Ottawa, which  
22 results in the preservation of parks as symbolic spaces under which 'natural  
23 environment' and 'national identity' blur. Ottawa's historic planning has resulted in a  
24 less intensive ecological focus in its greenbelt and greenway projects (Erickson, 2004),  
25 which still manifests itself in the day-to-day work of NCC conservation officers. The  
26 maintenance of a 'pristine' space involves confronting nuisances within the park and  
27 policing the behaviours that bleed beyond the park limits. NCC officers are entangled  
28 in a policing network, working with the RCMP and the OPS to ensure that urban order  
29 is maintained. The urban natures enacted through NCC work are selectively inclusive  
30 and exclude certain forms of conduct (e.g. public sex, homelessness) that officers define  
31 as nuisances.

32 The TRCA is responsible for policing the greenbelt that wraps around the  
33 amalgamated regions of the GTA and the greenways that cut through it. Compared  
34 with the NCC, the TRCA focuses on conservation and restoration of ecosystems that  
35 have been damaged by land development and sprawl. In the outer GTA and its  
36 greenways, the division between 'public' and 'private' space is porous and the work  
37 of conservation officers is oriented toward boundary maintenance. In confronting the  
38 intensifying processes of urbanization on the periphery, conservation officers seek  
39 to ensure that developers and other bad neighbours do not encroach on the 'pristine'  
40 space of the greenbelt. The TRCA is just one agency attempting to make certain  
41 that the ecologically minded greenbelt and greenway projects in the GTA are not  
42 undermined by the encroachment of developers (also see Fung and Conway,  
43 2007; Sandberg *et al.*, 2013). This project is advanced on a provincial scale, in the  
44 interests of orderly regional development. Consequently, the work of TRCA officers is  
45 oriented toward an 'ecological' perspective, involving networks with natural scientists  
46 such as geologists, ecologists and geographers rather than with traditional police  
47 agencies.

48 Conservation agencies are involved in the production of different urban natures. We  
49 have shown how this work can be situated through the spatial lenses of place, territory,  
50 scale and network (Jessop *et al.*, 2008). Rather than situating the work of conservation  
51 officers in 'natural' space, we have argued that conservation officers shape parks and  
greenbelts as 'pristine' through their boundary-making practices. With the development  
of increasingly specialized and multiscale arrangements governing 'urban'  
encroachment into the 'natural' environment, the regulatory work of conservation  
officers has become an important factor in producing and reinforcing urban natures.

Kevin Walby (kwalby@uvic.ca), Department of Sociology, University of Victoria, 3800  
Finnerty, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada V8W 3P5 and Chris Hurl  
(churl@connect.carleton.ca), Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Carleton  
University, 7thFloor, Loeb Building, 1125 Colonel by Drive, Ottawa, Ontario K1S 5B6,  
Canada.

## References

- Besmier, M. (2003) Ottawa: Federal Capital and First National Symbol. *Queen's Quarterly* 110.2, 196.
- Blomley, N. (2004) *Unsettling the city: urban land and the politics of property*. Routledge, New York.
- Carter, T. (2004) Force against and by game wardens in citizen encounters. *Police Quarterly* 7.4, 489–508.
- Carter, T. (2006) Police use of discretion: a participant observation study of game wardens. *Deviant Behavior* 27.4, 591–627.
- Cooper, D. (2002) Far beyond 'the early morning crowing of a farmyard cock': revisiting the place of nuisance within legal and political discourse. *Social and Legal Studies* 11.1, 5–35.
- Desfor, G. and R. Keil (1999) Contested and polluted terrain. *Local Environment* 4.3, 331–52.
- Desfor, G. and R. Keil (2000) Every river tells a story: the Don River (Toronto) and the Los Angeles River (Los Angeles) as articulating landscapes. *Journal of Environmental Policy* 2.1, 5–23.
- Desfor, G. and L. Vesalon (2008) Urban expansion and industrial nature: a political ecology of Toronto's port industrial district. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 32.3, 586–603.
- Eliason, S. (2011) Patrolling the peaks and the plains: an examination of big sky game wardens. *Criminal Justice Studies* 24.4, 409–18.
- Erickson, D. (2004) The relationship of historic city from and contemporary greenway implementation: a comparison of Milwaukee, Wisconsin (USA) and Ottawa, Ontario (Canada). *Landscape and Urban Planning* 68.2/3, 199–221.
- Escobar, A. (2001) Culture sits in place: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization. *Political Geography* 20.2, 139–74.
- Forsyth, C. (1994) Bookers and peacemakers: types of game wardens. *Sociological Spectrum* 14.1, 47–63.
- Fung, F. and T. Conway (2007) Greenbelts as an environmental planning tool: a case study of southern Ontario, Canada. *Journal of Environmental Policy and Planning* 9.2, 101–17.
- Gandy, M. (2002) *Concrete and clay: reworking nature in New York City*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Gordon, D. (2002) Frederick G. Todd and the origins of the park system in Canada's capital. *Journal of Planning History* 1.1, 29–57.
- Hermer, J. (2002) *The nature of order in North American parks: regulating Eden*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Hubber, M. and T. Currie (2007) The urbanization of an idea: imagining nature through urban growth boundary policy in Portland, Oregon. *Urban Geography* 28.8, 705–31.
- Jessop, B., N. Brenner and M. Jones (2008) Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 26.3, 389–401.
- Joyce, P. (2003) *The rule of freedom: liberalism and the modern city*. Verso, London.
- Keil, R. (1998) Toronto in the 1990s: dissociated governance? *Studies in Political Economy* 56, 151–67.
- Keil, R. and J. Boudreau (2006) Metro politics and metabolics: rolling out environmentalism in Toronto. In N. Heynen, M. Kaika and E. Swyngedouw (eds.), *The nature of the city: urban political ecology and the politics of urban metabolism*, Routledge, New York.
- Keil, R. and J. Graham (2006) Reasserting nature: constructing urban environments after Fordism. In B. Braun and N. Castree (eds.), *Remaking reality: nature at the millennium*, Routledge, New York.
- Latour, B. (1993) *We have never been modern*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Luymes, D. and K. Tamminga (1995) Integrating public safety and use into

- 1 planning urban greenways. *Landscape and*  
2 *Urban Planning* 33.4, 391–400.
- 3 Magnusson, W. (1981) Metropolitan reform in  
4 the capitalist city. *Canadian Journal of*  
5 *Political Science* 14.3, 557–85.
- 6 Mendoza, J. (2006) New cameras watching  
7 you at remic rapids. *Capital Xtra* 20 July.
- 8 Parés, M., H. March and D. Saurí (2013)  
9 Atlantic gardens in Mediterranean  
10 climates: understanding the production of  
11 suburban natures in Barcelona.  
12 *International Journal of Urban and*  
13 *Regional Research* 37.1, 328–437.
- 14 Pendleton, M. (1998) Policing the park:  
15 understanding soft enforcement. *Journal of*  
16 *Leisure Research* 30.4, 552–71.
- 17 Pendleton, M. (2000) Leisure, crime and  
18 cops: exploring a paradox of our civility.  
19 *Journal of Leisure Research* 32.1, 111–5.
- 20 Sandberg, L., G. Wekerle, and L. Gilbert  
21 (2013) *The Oak Ridges Moraine battles:*  
22 *development, sprawl, and nature*  
23 *conservation in the Toronto region.*  
24 University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Shelly, T. and M. Crow (2009) The nature  
and extent of conservation policing: law  
enforcement generalists or conservation  
specialists? *American Journal of Criminal*  
*Justice* 34.1, 9–27.
- Taylor, J., C. Paine and J. FitzGibbon (1995)  
From greenbelt to greenways: four  
Canadian case studies. *Landscape and*  
*Urban Planning* 33.1, 47–64.
- Valverde, M. (2011) Seeing like a city: the  
dialectic of modern and premodern ways  
of seeing in urban governance. *Law and*  
*Society Review* 45.2, 277–312.
- Valverde, M., R. Levi and D. Moore (2005)  
Legal knowledges of risk. In Law  
Commission of Canada (ed.), *Law and*  
*risk*, University of British Columbia Press,  
Vancouver.
- Yin, R. (2003) *Case study research: design*  
*and methods*. Sage, London.

## AUTHOR QUERY FORM

Dear Author,

During the preparation of your manuscript for publication, the questions listed below have arisen. Please attend to these matters and return this form with your proof.

Many thanks for your assistance.

Query References	Query	Remarks
1	AUTHOR: When were the interviews carried out (earlier you mention six interviews, so presumably there were two follow up interviews)?	
2	AUTHOR: PLEASE PROVIDE REFERENCE DETAILS	
3	AUTHOR: PLEASE CITE OR DELETE	
4	AUTHOR: Is this by Lucas Pereboom?	
5	AUTHOR: Please provide page no(s)	
6	AUTHOR: PLEASE CITE OR DELETE	
7	AUTHOR: Please could you ensure that the legislation and acts cited (now all in the footnotes) are fully and properly cited bearing in mind, for example, that SC, RSO etc. won't necessarily be familiar to non-Canadian readers	